

MISCELLANEOUS TESTIMONY:

Affidavit submitted to the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois Eastern Division in support of Illinois Public Act 93-0005 and the instructions it gives the Illinois Commerce Commission (No. 03 C 3290), on behalf of SBC Illinois, May 27, 2003.

Statement in support of Senate Bill 885 on behalf of SBC Illinois before a joint hearing of the House Public Utilities Committee and Senate Environment and Energy Committee of the Illinois State Legislature, in Springfield, Illinois, on UNE-P charges, May 5, 2003.

Statement (Appendix E) in the matter of Petition of TELUS Communications Inc. to the Governor in Council Government of Canada to vary Telecom Decision CRTC 2002-67, on behalf of TELUS, commenting on the economic and regulatory principles applicable to the determinations about the costs incumbent local exchange carriers are required to use, January 22, 2003.

Declaration before the Federal Communications Commission In the Matter of AT&T Corp. Petition for Rulemaking to Reform Regulation of Incumbent Local Exchange Carrier Rates for Interstate Special Access Services, on behalf of BellSouth Corporation, Qwest Corporation, SBC Communications, Inc., and Verizon (with William E. Taylor), December 2, 2002.

Reply Declaration (Attachment A) Before the Federal Communications Commission In the Matter of: Review of the Section 251 Unbundling Obligations of Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers (CC Docket No. 01-338); Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions in the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (CC Docket No. 96-98); Deployment of Wireline Services Offering Advanced Telecommunications Capability (CC Docket No. 98-147) (with Timothy J. Tardiff), July 17, 2002.

Statement and Report reviewing the applicable economic and regulatory principles, on behalf of TransGrid, submitted to the Australian National Electricity Tribunal, in its review of a NEMMCO decision approving that company's application for authority to construct the SNI interconnecting transmission line, July 3, 2002.

Statement submitted to the New Zealand Commerce Commission on behalf of Telecom Corporation of New Zealand (with Timothy J. Tardiff), commenting on the Commission's responsibility for establishing a universal funding mechanism for Telecom's telecommunications service obligation, June 10, 2002.

Statement submitted to the New Zealand Commerce Commission on behalf of Telecom Corporation of New Zealand, commenting on its responsibility for making access determinations under the Telecommunications Act of 2001, April 19, 2002.

Declaration submitted in the United States District Court for the Northern District of New York in support of temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction on behalf of Verizon New York, contending that the New York Public Service Commission has not followed the instructions of the FCC in determining its proper gross cost of capital, February 4, 2002.

Statement submitted to the U.S. Federal Energy Regulatory Commission on behalf of a group of electric generating companies appraising the proposal of the Commission to condition its granting of market-based rate authority on the assurance that sellers not engage in "anticompetitive behavior

or the exercise of market power,” Docket No. EL01-118-000 (97 FERC ¶ 61,220 [2001]), January 7, 2002.

Declaration submitted to the U.S. Federal Communications Commission on behalf of Verizon regarding broadband regulation (with Timothy J. Tardiff), December 18, 2001.

Statement submitted to the U.S. Department of Transportation on behalf of American Airlines regarding their proposed alliance with British Airways, October 30, 2001.

Statement on behalf of Auckland International Airport Ltd on the treatment of land held for future construction of an additional runway in the pricing of its aviation services, in response to the New Zealand Commerce Commission’s draft report, *Price Control Study of Airfield Activities at Auckland, Wellington and Christchurch International Airports*. Statement submitted August 10, 2001.

Testimony before the New York Public Service Commission on behalf of Verizon New York Inc., in the Proceeding on Motion of the Commission to Consider Cost Recovery by Verizon and to Investigate the Future Regulatory Framework (Case 00-C-1945), May 15, 2001.

Statement of opinion before the New York Public Service Commission on the petition by Telergy Metro, LLC asking the Commission to rescind the license that it issued to Con Edison’s sibling corporation to construct or install fiber optic telecommunications facilities, making use of portions of Con Edison’s transmission and distribution facilities for that purpose, on behalf of Con Edison, April 5, 2001.

Submission to the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission on behalf of the Sydney Airports Corporation on land valuation and “single-till” issues raised by its application in December 2000 for a revision in charges for aeronautical services. Paper submitted January 18, 2001.

Declaration before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission reviewing the Oil Pipeline Pricing Index, in response to the Commission’s Notice of Inquiry, on behalf of the Association of Oil Pipe Lines (18 CFR Part 342, Docket No. RM00-11-000), filed August 31, 2000; Rebuttal, October 2, 2000.

Public Interest Affidavit before the Federal Communications Commission in the matter of Application of SBC Communications Inc., Nevada Bell Telephone Company, and Southwestern Bell Communications Services, Inc. d/b/a Nevada Bell Long Distance, for Provision of In-Region InterLATA Services in Nevada (with Timothy J. Tardiff), filed July 24, 2000.

Testimony before the Delaware Public Service Commission on behalf of Delmarva Power & Light Company, Concerning the Cost Accounting Manual and the Code of Conduct, PSC Docket No. 99-582, November 1999; Rebuttal Testimony, March 29, 2000.

Testimony before the Department of Transportation in support of the application of American Airlines to be designated as an authorized carrier between the United States and China under the bilateral agreement between the two countries, OST-99-6323, February 23, 2000.

Brief of Evidence in the High Court of New Zealand in support of the claim of Telstra New Zealand that Telecom New Zealand has employed its dominant position in the customer access and local services markets to prevent or deter competition with it in a number of markets, in violation of Section 36 of the Commerce Act of 1986, CL No. 16/99, filed February 16, 2000.

Public Interest Affidavit before the Federal Communications Commission in the matter of Application of SBC Communications, Inc., Southwestern Bell Telephone Company, and Southwestern Bell Communications Services, Inc., d/b/a Southwestern Bell Long Distance for Provision of In-Region, InterLATA Services in Texas, on behalf of Southwestern Bell Telephone Company (with Timothy J. Tardiff), filed January 10, 2000.

Comments before the New York Public Service Commission, on behalf of Consolidated Edison Company of New York, on its request for approval of an agreement granting its affiliate Consolidated Edison Communications, Inc. (CECI), non-exclusive access to its facilities for the purposes of constructing, installing, and operating certain telecommunications facilities, Case 99-M-0811, September 10, 1999.

“Relaxed Regulation of High Capacity Services in Phoenix and Seattle: The Time is Now,” before the Federal Communications Commission on behalf of U S West Communications (with Timothy J. Tardiff), July 23, 1999.

Declaration before the Federal Communications Commission in response to *Second Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking* in the matter of Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions in the Telecommunications Act of 1996, on behalf of GTE-Bell Atlantic, CC Docket No. 96-98, filed May 26, 1999; Reply Declaration filed June 10, 1999.

“New Jersey Affiliate Relations Standards,” on codes of conduct, before the New Jersey Board of Public Utilities on behalf of Public Service Electric & Gas of New Jersey, May 4, 1999.

Rebuttal Testimony before the Public Service Commission of Maryland, defending a regulated electric distribution company’s ability to offer a regulated retail electric generation service and of an unregulated affiliate offering competitive services and the sufficiency of the Maryland Code of Conduct to prevent distortions of competition and cross-subsidization; and defending Baltimore Gas and Electric’s proposed shopping credit, on behalf of Baltimore Gas and Electric Company, Case Nos. 8794/8804, March 22, 1999.

“High Capacity Competition in Seattle: Reply to Comments of Intervening Parties,” before the Federal Communications Commission on behalf of U S West Communications (with Timothy J. Tardiff), March 10, 1999.

Testimony before the Public Service Commission of the State of Missouri in the matter of application of SBC Communications, Inc., Southwestern Bell Telephone Company, and Southwestern Bell Communications Services, Inc., d/b/a Southwestern Bell Long Distance for Provision of In-Region, InterLATA Services in Missouri, on behalf of Southwestern Bell Telephone Company (with Timothy J. Tardiff), Docket No. TO 99-227, filed November 20, 1998; Surrebuttal Affidavit, February 1, 1999.

Rebuttal Testimony before The Commonwealth of Massachusetts Department of Telecommunications and Energy on public policy considerations and principles re the Boston Edison Company/RCN joint venture (DPU 93-37), on behalf of Boston Edison Company, DTE 97-95, February 12, 1999.

“Comments on Exclusionary Airline Pricing,” Submission to the Department of Transportation, September 25, 1998.

“Economic Evaluation of High Capacity Competition in Phoenix,” on behalf of U S West Communications, requesting that the FCC forebear from regulating it as a dominant carrier in its sale of high capacity services in the Phoenix metropolitan area (with Timothy J. Tardiff), August 14, 1998 (filed August 19, 1998).

Declaration before the Federal Communications Commission in the matter of Implementation of the Pay Telephone Reclassification and Compensation Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (CC Docket No. 96-128), on behalf of the RBOC/GTE/SNET Payphone Coalition, July 13, 1998.

Testimony before the Public Service Commission of Maryland evaluating the restructuring plan proposed by Baltimore Gas & Electric Company (Case No. 8794), on behalf of Baltimore Gas & Electric Company, July 1, 1998.

Statement before the Public Utility Commission of Texas regarding the Proposed Rulemaking on Code of Conduct for Electric Utilities and Their Affiliates, on behalf of Texas Utilities, June 19, 1998.

Affidavit Before the Federal Communications Commission in the matter of Application of SBC Communications Inc., Southwestern Bell Telephone Company, and Southwestern Bell Communications Services, Inc. d/b/a Southwestern Bell Long Distance for Provision of In-Region, InterLATA Services in Arkansas (with Timothy J. Tardiff), February 24, 1998; Rebuttal Affidavit, June 12, 1998.

Comments on the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission Proposed Rulemaking Regarding the Establishment of Competitive Safeguards for the Pennsylvania Electric Industry, on behalf of the Pennsylvania Electric Association, June 9, 1998.

Testimony Before the State Corporation Commission of the State of Kansas in the matter of Southwestern Bell Telephone Company – Kansas’ Compliance With Section 271 of the Federal Telecommunications Act of 1996, Docket No. 97-SWBT-411-GIT (with Timothy J. Tardiff), February 17, 1998; Rebuttal Testimony, May 27, 1998.

Rebuttal Affidavit Before the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California in support of Pacific Bell’s Draft Application for Authority to Provide InterLATA Services in California (with Timothy J. Tardiff), May 20, 1998.

Rebuttal Testimony Before the Oklahoma Public Service Commission, in support of the Applications of SBC Communications, Inc., Southwestern Bell Telephone Company, and Southwestern Bell Communications Services, Inc., for Provision of In-Region InterLATA Services in Oklahoma, Cause No. PUD 970000560 (with Timothy J. Tardiff), April 21, 1998.

Testimony Before the State of New Jersey Board of Public Utilities, in the matter of Energy Master Plan Phase II Proceeding to Investigate the Future Structure of the Electric Power Industry, Docket Nos. EX94120585Y and EO97070463, regarding restructuring basic generation service, on behalf of Public Service Electric and Gas Company, April 16, 1998.

Affidavit before the Federal Communications Commission in the matter of Application of SBC Communications Inc., Southwestern Bell Telephone Company and Southwestern Bell Communications Services, Inc. d/b/a Southwestern Bell Long Distance for Provision of In-Region

InterLATA Services in Texas (with Timothy J. Tardiff), March 2, 1998; Reply Affidavit April 17, 1998.

Affidavit Before the Federal Communications Commission in the matter of Application of SBC Communications Inc., Pacific Bell, and Pacific Bell Communications for Provision of In-Region InterLATA Services in California (with Timothy J. Tardiff), March 31, 1998.

Affidavit Before the Illinois Commerce Commission in the matter of Implementation of Section 16-121 of the Public Utilities Act, No. 98-0035, on behalf of Ameren Services, February 17, 1998; Rebuttal Affidavit, March 12, 1998.

Affidavit Before the Federal Communications Commission in the matter of Application of SBC Communications Inc., Southwestern Bell Telephone Company, and Southwestern Bell Communications Services, Inc. d/b/a Southwestern Bell Long Distance for Provision of In-Region, InterLATA Services in Oklahoma (with Timothy J. Tardiff), February 13, 1998.

Testimony Before the Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities on public policy considerations and principles re the Boston Edison Company/RCN joint venture (DPU 93-37), December 29, 1997.

Testimony Before the Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities on the Standards of Conduct for Distribution Companies and Their Affiliated Companies, on behalf of Boston Edison Company (DPU 97-96), November 21, 1997.

Statement Before the California Public Utilities Commission on Order Instituting Investigation to Establish Standards of Conduct Governing Relationships between Energy Utilities and Their Affiliates, on behalf of Edison Electric Institute (Docket No. I.97-04-012), November 17, 1997.

Rebuttal Testimony Before the Delaware Public Service Commission Concerning the Cost Accounting Manual and the Code of Conduct, on behalf of Delmarva Power & Light Company. Docket No. 97-65, October 20, 1997.

Verified Statement Before the Surface Transportation Board on the need for shipper protections created by the acquisition of Conrail by the Norfolk & Southern and CSX Railroads, on behalf of electric utility shippers of coal (with Frederick C. Dunbar). Finance Docket No. 33388, October 20, 1997.

Testimony Before the Public Utility Commission of the State of Texas evaluating AT&T's proposed rates for unbundled network elements, on behalf of Southwestern Bell Telephone Company. Docket Nos. 16189, et al, September 15, 1997.

Affidavit Before the Public Service Commission of the State of Missouri In the Matter of AT&T Communications of the Southwest, Inc.'s Petition for Arbitration pursuant to Section 252(b) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 to Establish an Interconnection Agreement with Southwestern Bell Telephone Company, Case No. TO-97-40, on behalf of Southwestern Bell, August 20, 1997.

Rebuttal Testimony Before the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission on the merits of stranded cost recovery, the estimation of stranded costs and competitive safeguards, on behalf of Pennsylvania Power & Light Company, Docket No. R-00973954, August 4, 1997.

Affidavit Before the Federal Communications Commission In the matter of Application of SBC Communications, Inc., Southwestern Bell Telephone Company, and Southwestern Bell Communications Services, Inc., for Provisions of In-Region, InterLATA Services in Oklahoma, CC

Docket 97-121 (with Timothy J. Tardiff), on behalf of Southwestern Bell, February 13, 1997 (Filed April 7, 1997); Reply Affidavit, May 28, 1997.

Affidavit Before the Federal Communications Commission In the matter of Application of SBC Communications, Inc., Southwestern Bell Telephone Company, and Southwestern Bell Communications Services, Inc., for Provision of In-Region, InterLATA Services in Kansas, CC Docket 97-121 (with Timothy J. Tardiff), on behalf of Southwestern Bell, April, 1997.

Statement in Support of The Southern New England Telephone Company's Proposed Reorganization, on behalf of SNET, March 24, 1997.

Statement of Professor Alfred E. Kahn and Report of Professor Jerome E. Hass on Railroad Revenue Adequacy Standards, analyzing the methods by which the Surface Transportation Board determines whether individual railroads are or are not "revenue adequate," on behalf of the Alliance for Rail Competition, February 1997.

Statement of Alfred E. Kahn on FCC's Proposed Reforms of Carrier Access Charges (re proposed Order in CC Docket No. 96-488), on behalf of the United States Telephone Association, February 14, 1997.

Verified Statement Before the Surface Transportation Board on behalf of the National Industrial Transportation League and the Western Coal Traffic League commenting on the joint statement submitted by the Association of American Railroads, Docket No. 41626, Docket No. 41242, Docket No. 41295, November 27, 1996.

"Joint Marketing, Personnel Separation and Efficient Competition Under the Telecommunications Act of 1996" (with Timothy J. Tardiff), a statement on behalf of U S West commenting on the FCC's NPRM of July 17th, in CC Docket No. 96-149, October 11, 1996.

"Economic Competition in Local Exchange Markets" (with Kenneth Gordon and William E. Taylor), on behalf of Bell Atlantic Company, commenting on a statement by seven economists on the pricing of essential network elements submitted by AT&T in state arbitration proceedings, August 9, 1996.

Declaration Before the Federal Communications Commission In the Matter of Allocation of Costs Associated with Local Exchange Carrier Provision of Video Programming Services, CC Docket No. 96-112, July 19, 1996.

Testimony before the Kansas Corporation Commission commenting on the continuing regulation and deregulation of the telecommunications industry in Kansas with reference to Competition docket HB 2728, on behalf of Southwestern Bell, Docket No. 190,492-U, June 14, 1996.

Declaration before the Federal Communications Commission In the Matter of Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions in the Telecommunications Act of 1996, on behalf of Bell Atlantic (with Timothy J. Tardiff), CC Docket No. 96-98, May 30, 1996.

Testimony before the Public Service Commission of Maryland In Support of the Petition of Bell Atlantic - Maryland, Inc. for Adoption of a Price Cap Form of Alternative Regulation, on behalf of Bell Atlantic - Maryland, February 15, 1996; Rebuttal March 14, 1996; Surrebuttal April 1, 1996.

Testimony before the Public Service Commission of Pennsylvania regarding the Formal Investigation to Examine and Establish Updated Universal Service Principles and Policies for

Telecommunications Services, Docket No. I-940035, on behalf of Bell Atlantic - Pennsylvania, Inc., December 7, 1995; Rebuttal, February 14, 1996.

Affidavit before the Public Service Commission of Maryland In the Matter of the Petition of Bell Atlantic-Maryland, Inc. for Adoption of an Alternative Form of Regulation pursuant to Amended Public Service Commission Law, Article 78, Section 69(E), on behalf of Bell Atlantic-Maryland, December 21, 1995.

Rebuttal Testimony before the State of Connecticut Department of Public Utility Control, discussing network unbundling, universal service and apportioning loop costs between telephone and video services, on behalf of the Southern New England Telephone Company, Docket No. 95-06-17, September 20, 1995.

Affidavit In the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia (Alexandria Division) in the matter of United States Telephone Association, et al v. Federal Communications Commission, Civil Action No. 95-533-A, on behalf of USTA (with William E. Taylor), October 24, 1995.

“Preserving Universality of Subscription to Telephone Service in an Increasingly Competitive Industry” (with Timothy J. Tardiff), before the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California, on behalf of Pacific Bell, September 1, 1995.

Rebuttal Testimony before the Commonwealth of Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities, Docket 94-185, discussing network unbundling and universality of service, on behalf of NYNEX, August 23, 1995.

“Alternative Regulation for Connecticut Telecommunications Services,” before the Connecticut Department of Public Utility Control, discussing the economic principles that should guide the introduction of an alternative form of regulation for noncompetitive telecommunications services, on behalf of the Southern New England Telephone Company, Docket No. 95-03-01, June 15, 1995.

Rebuttal Testimony before the New Jersey Board of Regulatory Commissioners, in the matter of the Investigation Regarding IntraLATA Toll Service Competition on a Presubscription Basis, Docket No. TX94090388, on behalf of Bell Atlantic - New Jersey, Inc., May 31, 1995.

Testimony before the Connecticut Department of Public Utility Control on strandable investments, on behalf of United Illuminating, Docket 94-12-13, March 24, 1995.

“Rebuttal Evidence on Rate-base Splitting, Price Caps and the Treatment of Economies of Scope in Telecommunications Regulation,” submission to Canadian Radio/television and Telecommunications Commission, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada, on behalf of AGT Limited, March 30, 1995.

“Preconditions of Efficiently Competitive Local Exchange Markets,” submission to Canadian Radio/television and Telecommunications Commission, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada, on behalf of AGT Limited, March 15, 1995.

Testimony before the Connecticut Department of Public Utility Control, Docket Nos. 94-10-01-02, on incremental cost standards for network unbundling, on behalf of the Southern New England Telephone Company, January 10, 1995; Rebuttal Testimony, February 13, 1995.

“Comments on Competition in Electric Power,” submission to Rhode Island Division of Public Utilities and Carriers, inquiry into retail competition in the electric utility industry, on behalf of The Narragansett Electric Company, Docket D-94-9, November 18, 1994.

Testimony before the State of New York Public Service Commission in the Petition of Rochester Telephone Corporation for Approval of Proposed Restructuring Plan (Panel on Public Policy Issues with Robert W. Crandall), Case Nos. 93-C-0033 and 93-C-0103, February 3, 1993; Testimony of Panel on Public Policy Issues in Support of Settlement, June 17, 1994; Rebuttal Testimony of Panel on Public Policy Issues, July 22, 1994.

Affidavit before the Federal Communications Commission In the Matter of Price Cap Performance Review for Local Exchange Carriers, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, on behalf of Bell Atlantic, filed June 29, 1994.

Affidavit before the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Alabama Southern Division on behalf of BellSouth Corporation on overturning the statutory prohibition of telephone companies carrying their own video programming, filed June 3, 1994.

Reply Affidavit before the U.S. District Court for the District of Michigan (Eastern Division) on behalf of Ameritech Corporation on overturning the statutory prohibition of telephone companies carrying their own video programming, filed May 16, 1994.

Affidavit before the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia on behalf of Southwestern Bell in support of request for out-of-region waiver from the interLATA MFJ restrictions (with William E. Taylor), filed May 12, 1994.

Reply Affidavit before the U.S. District Court for the District of Maine on behalf of NYNEX Corporation on overturning the statutory prohibition of telephone companies carrying their own video programming, filed May 6, 1994.

Testimony on behalf of Bell Atlantic-New Jersey in proceeding involving the issue of opening the intraLATA toll market to competition, filed April 7, 1994; Rebuttal Testimony filed April 25, 1994.

Testimony on behalf of Massachusetts Electric Company before the Federal Energy Commission on wholesale wheeling and the problem of stranded investment. FERC Docket No. ER94-129-000, filed March 14, 1994.

Testimony on behalf of The Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Company of Maryland, Case No. 8584, on the regulatory principles applicable to determining an efficient price for MFS-I's interconnection with C&P's network (with William E. Taylor), filed November 19, 1993; Rebuttal Testimony filed January 10, 1994; Surrebuttal Testimony filed January 24, 1994.

Affidavit to the Federal Communications Commission with respect to Interstate Long Distance Competition and AT&T's Motion for Reclassification as a Nondominant Carrier (with William E. Taylor), filed November 12, 1993.

Affidavit to the High Court of New Zealand on behalf of New Zealand Rail Limited involving wharfage charges by Port Marlborough, September 27, 1993.

Testimony before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission On Behalf of a Group of Independent Refiner/Shippers on the proposed Revision to Oil Pipeline Regulations under the Energy Policy Act of 1992, Docket No. RM93-11-000, August 12, 1993.

Affidavit to the High Court of New Zealand on behalf of Air New Zealand, Ltd., and others in a proceeding involving landing charges by Wellington International Airport, Ltd., June 25, 1993. Second Affidavit, August 19, 1993.

Affidavit before the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia in the matter of *The Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Company of Virginia v. United States of America*, Civil Action No. 92-1751-A, June 5, 1993 and before the Federal Communications Commission *In the Matter of Amendments of Parts 32, 36, 61, 64 and 69 of the Commission's Rules to Establish and Implement Regulatory Procedures for Video Dial Tone Service*, Petition for Rulemaking RM 8221, June 7, 1993.

Testimony before Denver County District Court, Denver, Colorado, on behalf of Metropolitan Denver Water Authority re City of Denver water rates, May 17, 1993.

"Review of Regulatory Framework: Telecom Public Notice CRTC 92-78," on behalf of AGT (Alberta Government Telephone Company), Alberta Canada, April 13, 1993.

"Major Elements of a Competitive Telecommunications Policy," on behalf of AGT (Alberta Government Telephone Company), Alberta, Canada, February 15, 1993

Testimony on behalf of the Municipal Electric Association evaluating the soundness of Ontario Hydro's Demand Side Management program, December 1992.

Rebuttal Testimony on behalf of Sithe Independence Power Partners, L.P., in response to the arguments advanced by the New York Power Authority and the County of Westchester in opposition to the proposed transmission line at issue in PSC Cases 92-T-0114 and 92-T-0252, November 1992.

Affidavit before the Federal Communications Commission *In the Matter of Amendment of the Commission's Rules to Establish New Personal Communications Services*, GEN Docket No. 90-314, ET Docket No. 92-100, November 6, 1992.

Testimony on behalf of New Zealand Telecom in an antitrust proceeding before the High Court of New Zealand involving terms of interconnection with Clear, a competitive provider of local transport, April 27, 1992.

Testimony on behalf of AMR Corporation and American Airlines, Inc., against UAL Corporation, United Airlines, Inc., UAL Acquisition, Inc., Air Wisconsin Services, Inc., and Air Wisconsin, Inc., 91 CIV. 7773 (KMW), analyzing United Airlines' acquisition of Air Wisconsin's 50 O'Hare jet slots, March 2, 1991. Supplemental and Second Supplemental Testimonies, March 10 and 15, 1992.

Testimony before the Illinois Commerce Commission on behalf of Illinois Power Company, Docket No. P91-0001, on certification of a competing natural gas pipeline, February 24, 1992.

Rebuttal Testimony before the Florida Public Service Commission, Tampa Electric Co. Docket No. 910883EI, on electric utility company responsibilities for demand side management, November 20, 1991.

Affidavit before the Federal Communications Commission *In the Matter of Expanded Interconnection Between Local Telephone Facilities*, CC Docket No. 91-141 ENF-87-14, August 5, 1991.

Statement on behalf of United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland in US/UK Arbitration Concerning Heathrow Airport User Charges, April 1991. Rebuttal and Surrebuttal Statements, June and July 1991; testimony before the International Court, The Hague, July 1991.

“The Treatment of New Services Under Price Cap Regulation,” on behalf of BellSouth, Federal Communications Commission, June 10, 1991.

Testimony on behalf of Fireman’s Fund Insurance Company before the Insurance Commissioner of the State of California re proposed action to repeal and adopt regulations concerning property and casualty insurance rates, February 20, 1991.

Testimony before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission on behalf of Conoco, Inc. Kaneb Pipeline Operating Partnership, L.P., and Kerr-McGee Refining Corporation (Williams Pipeline), February 4, 1991.

Affidavit to the U.S. District Court for District of Columbia on behalf of Bell Atlantic Corporation in *United States of America v. Western Electric Company, Inc. and American Telephone and Telegraph Company*, re MFJ restrictions on Bell Operating Companies’ ability to offer information services, January 8, 1991.

Oral testimony before the Puerto Rican Legislature on privatization and future regulation of the Puerto Rico Telephone Company, June 20, 1990.

Testimony on behalf of Central Telephone Company of Florida before the Public Service Commission, June 12, 1990.

Testimony on behalf of Fireman’s Fund Insurance Company on Proposition 103 Rate Regulation Hearings, February 5, 1990.

Testimony before Denver County District Court, Denver, Colorado, on behalf of Southgate Water District vs. Denver Water Authority on conduit extension charges, May 25, 1989.

“Efficient Pricing of Congested Airport Facilities,” A Report to the Department of Transport, Great Britain, April 1989.

Testimony on behalf of ETSI Pipeline Project v. Burlington Northern Inc., et al, in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas, Beaumont Division, Civil Action No. B-84-979-CA, February 23, 1989.

Reply Verified Statement on behalf of Concerned Shippers, In the Matter of Railroad Cost Recovery Procedures—Productivity Adjustment; Ex Parte No. 290 (Sub-No. 4), January 17, 1989.

Testimony on behalf of California Coalition for Trucking Deregulation before the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California, In the Matter of the Regulation of General Freight Transportation by Truck, Case No. I-88-08-046, October 27, 1988.

Testimony before the Public Service Commission of the State of New York on the application to construct the Empire State gas pipeline, Case No. 88-T-132, October 1988.

Testimony before the Federal Communications Commission on behalf of Bell South on adjustment factor for local exchange companies under rate cap regulation, In the Matter of Policy and Rules Concerning Rates for Dominant Carriers (CC Docket 87-313), July 1988.

Affidavit on behalf of Massachusetts Port Authority in a proceeding on the proposed structure of landing fees for Logan Airport, Boston, U.S. District Court, District of Massachusetts, June 1988.

Affidavit on behalf of Financial Interchange Inc. in an antitrust arbitration proceeding on the legality of jointly set interchange fees of an electronic funds transfer network, April 1988.

Verified Statement before the Interstate Commerce Commission in Coal Trading Corporation, et al. v. Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company, et al. (Docket No. 38301S) on the computation of rail stand-alone costs, April 1988.

Testimony on behalf of Public Service Electric & Gas Company, New Jersey on the used and useful doctrine in the context of utility performance standards, April 1988.

Testimony on behalf of the U.S. Postal Service on the pricing of Express Mail, March 28, 1988.

Testimony on behalf of Kentucky Industrial Utility Customers Case No. 9934 on the criteria for deciding whether a nuclear plant should be completed, February 8, 1988.

Testimony and Rebuttal Testimony before the Iowa State Utilities Board Department of Commerce on behalf of Northwestern Bell on the regulatory treatment of depreciation reserve deficiencies, October 1987 and November 1987.

Testimony before the State of Connecticut Department of Public Utility Control on behalf of the Connecticut Cable Television Association on regulating cable television rates, November 13, 1987.

Testimony before the Federal Communications Commission on behalf of Bell South In the Matter of Policy and Rules Concerning Rates for Dominant Carriers (CC Docket 87-313) October 1987 and Reply Testimony, November 1987.

Reply Verified Statement before the Interstate Commerce Commission on behalf of McCarty Farms et. al. and Montana Department of Commerce, on the stand-alone cost constraint on railroad rates to captive shippers, October 2, 1987.

Testimony before the New York State Public Service Commission on behalf of New York Telephone Company on assessing the competitiveness of telecommunications markets, April 1987.

Testimony before the New Jersey Senate Energy and Environment Committee on behalf of Public Service Electric and Gas Company on draft bill, No. 2801, the "Electricity Market Pricing Act of 1986," January 26, 1987.

Testimony before Federal Energy Regulatory Commission on behalf of Interstate Natural Gas Association of America on "Competitive Implications of Natural Gas Pipeline Marketing Affiliates," December 29, 1986.

Testimony before the New York State Public Service Commission on behalf of the Owners Committee on Electric Rates, Inc., on rent-inclusion and submetering, November 19, 1986.

Testimony before the Illinois Commerce Commission on behalf of Commonwealth Edison Company on standard for deciding whether Braidwood Unit 2 should be cancelled, August 4, 1986.

Verified Statement on Standards for Railroad Revenue Adequacy, on Interstate Commerce Commission's Ex Parte No. 393, Sub-No.1, July 1986.

Supplemental Verified Statement before the Interstate Commerce Commission, Docket No. 38783, Omaha Public Power District v. Burlington Northern Railroad Company on behalf of Omaha Public Power District, April 1986.

Statement to Federal Communications Commission on New England Telephone Company's Proposed Interstate Access Tariff Restructure, January 30, 1986.

Testimony before the Public Utilities Commission of the State of Oregon on inverted rate structures on behalf of the Pacific Power & Light company, January 1986.

Rebuttal Testimony before the California Public Utilities Commission on San Onofre nuclear plants on behalf of Southern California Edison Company, January 1986 and En Banc Proceeding, February 1986.

Testimony and rebuttal testimony before the Arizona Corporation Commission on behalf of Arizona Public Service Company on economic and regulatory principles applicable to entry of nuclear plants into rate base, December 1985, March 1986, December 1986 and March 1987.

Testimony before the Corporation Commission of the State of Oklahoma on economic principles applicable to access charges, Cause No. 29321 on behalf of Southwestern Bell Telephone Company, September 1985.

Testimony before the California Public Utilities Commission on regulatory principles applicable to prudence determinations on behalf of Southern California Edison Company, August 1985.

Testimony before the Corporation Commission of the State of Oklahoma on development of intrastate access charges, Cause No. 28309 on behalf of Southwestern Bell Telephone Company, May 1985.

Verified Statement before the Interstate Commerce Commission, Docket No. 38783 on behalf of Omaha Public Power District, on the grouping of captive shippers for purposes of applying a stand-alone cost test of contested rail rates, November 1984.

Testimony before the House Public Policy and Veterans Affairs Committee of the Indiana General Assembly on behalf of the Indiana Telephone Association, October 25, 1984.

Testimony before the Iowa State Commerce Commission, Docket No. INU-84-6, Investigation into competition in communications services and facilities, October 18, 1984.

Testimony and rebuttal testimony on current cash support for construction and the reorientation of regulatory policy before the Maine Public Utilities Commission, in the matter of Central Maine Power Company's proposed increase in rates, Docket No. 84-120, August 1984 and February 1985.

Testimony and rebuttal testimony for Illinois Power Company on rate base treatment of construction work in progress, before Illinois Commerce Commission, Docket No. 84-0480, August 1984 and April 1985.

Verified Statement before the Interstate Commerce Commission, Docket No. 39687, on behalf of Platte River Power Authority, on the proper definition of the cost of capital for purposes of applying a stand-alone cost test of contested rail rates, July 1984.

Verified Statement and Surrebuttal Verified Statement Before the Interstate Commerce Commission, Finance Docket No. 30300 on behalf of the Water Transport Association, in

opposition to the application of CSX Corporation to acquire American Commercial Barge Lines, Inc., February 14, 1984 and April 19, 1984.

Direct and rebuttal testimony, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Trans Alaska Pipeline System, on behalf of the State of Alaska, Dockets Nos. OR 78-1-014 and OR 78-1-016 (Phase I Remand) November 1, 1983 and December 23, 1983.

Verified Statement, Interstate Commerce Commission, on the stand alone test for rail rates to captive shippers, on behalf of Utility Fuels, Inc., Docket No. 39002, October 3, 1983.

Testimony on telephone rate structures before the Colorado Public Utilities Commission for Mountain States Telephone & Telegraph Company, May 27, 1983; the California Public Utilities Commission, for Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Company, August 18, 1983; the Missouri Public Service Commission, September 8, 1983; and Texas Public Service Commission, September 19, 1983, for Southwestern Bell Company.

Testimony before the Utility Diversification Committee of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, September 2, 1982.

Testimony before the Ad Hoc Committee on Utility Diversification, National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners, May 6, 1982.

Testimony before Motor Carrier Ratemaking Study Commission, Orlando, Florida, April 2, 1982.

Testimony before the State of Connecticut Department of Public Utility Control on methods of regulating rates for basic television cable service, March 9, 1982.

Testimony before the Committee of Energy and Public Utilities, The General Assembly of the State of Connecticut on regulation of cable television, March 1, 1982.

Testimony before the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California, for Pacific Power & Light Company on methods of allocating aggregate revenue requirements, September 24, 1981.

Verified Statement, Interstate Commerce Commission, Ex Parte No. 347 (Sub-No. 1), "Coal Rate Guidelines-Nationwide," September 1981.

Testimony for the Department of Justice in the U.S. v. Standard Oil Co. (Indiana) et al. Civil Suit 40212, filed July 28, 1964.

(Rev. 12/03)

**DECLARATION OF ALFRED E. KAHN AND
TIMOTHY J. TARDIFF**

EXHIBIT 2

TIMOTHY J. TARDIFF

BUSINESS ADDRESS

National Economic Research Associates, Inc.
200 Clarendon Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02116
(617) 621-2614

Dr. Tardiff received a B.S. with honors in Mathematics from the California Institute of Technology in Pasadena and a Ph.D. degree in Social Science from the University of California, Irvine, under a National Science Foundation Pre-doctoral Fellowship and an NSF Grant for Improving Dissertation Research in the Social Sciences.

Dr. Tardiff joined the faculties of the Department of Civil Engineering and the Division of Environmental Studies at the University of California, Davis. He taught undergraduate and graduate level courses in transportation and environmental policy analysis. His research included applications of econometric models of consumer choice to transportation planning problems. Dr. Tardiff's research was funded by the National Science Foundation, the Institute of Transportation Studies and the California Department of Transportation.

Prior to joining NERA, Dr. Tardiff's work included transportation, energy, public utility and telephone industry projects for the U.S. Departments of Transportation and Energy, the California Energy Commission, and several telephone and electric utilities.

Since joining NERA, he has evaluated pricing policies for increasingly competitive telecommunications markets, including appropriate mechanisms for pricing access services to competitors; studied actual and potential competition for services provided by telephone operating companies; analyzed the demand and revenue impacts of new telephone rate structures; developed and evaluated damage studies used in major telecommunications antitrust actions; analyzed the demand for wireless telephony; evaluated the investment and marketing programs of telephone companies; and developed a demand model for analyzing the market potential for alternative employee health care plans, including health maintenance organizations. Dr. Tardiff's international research and consulting experience includes studies of the Japanese long-distance industry, consultation on competitive policies for the Canadian local exchange industry, and participation in interconnection and universal service proceedings pursuant to New Zealand's 2001 Telecommunication Act.

Dr. Tardiff has published extensively in the transportation literature. He has presented and published papers on the telecommunications industry. These papers address the issues of

pricing and costing policies for emerging competition in telecommunications markets; evaluating and forecasting the impacts of telephone rate plans such as local measured service; analyzing the markets for new telecommunications products and services; and local competition policy issues.

EDUCATION

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, IRVINE
Ph.D., Social Sciences, 1974

CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
B.S., Mathematics, 1971

EMPLOYMENT

NATIONAL ECONOMIC RESEARCH ASSOCIATES, INC.

1992 Vice President. Works on cases, mainly legal and regulatory, on issues of pricing policy, assessing demand for new and existing products and services, and economic damages. This work involves studies, often involving econometric demand analysis methods, for telecommunications, utilities and other clients. Specific areas have included: assessment of competition in the telecommunications industry; analysis of alternative approaches for regulating telephone utilities; evaluation of the benefits from telecommunication products and services; analyzing the demand for local services, toll, and carrier access; evaluation of the prudence of telephone company investments; damage studies for telecommunications antitrust cases; evaluation of methods for environmental damage assessment; and analysis of energy conservation /programs.

1984-1992 Senior Consultant

CHARLES RIVER ASSOCIATES, INC.--Boston, Massachusetts

1979-1984 Director of Marketing Research. Managed program to apply econometric customer demand models to marketing research problems in telecommunications, electric utilities, transportation and other industries.

Senior Research Associate. Performed studies on urban transportation, freight transportation, energy and telecommunications issues.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, DAVIS--Davis, California

1974-1979 Assistant Professor, Department of Civil Engineering and Division of Environmental Studies. Taught undergraduate and graduate course in

transportation and environmental policy and quantitative research methods; conducted research on passenger transportation demand, (including econometric issues).

FELLOWSHIPS, GRANTS, AWARDS

First Place, Dissertation Contest of the Transportation Science
Section of the Operations Research Society of America.

NSF Research Initiation Grant (Engineering Division), 1976-1978.

NSF Grant for Improving Doctoral Dissertation Research in the Social Sciences,
1973-1974.

NSF Predoctoral Fellowship, 1972-1974.

Public Health Service Traineeship, 1971-1972.

AFFILIATIONS

American Economic Association

TESTIMONY

Declaration of William E. Taylor, Timothy J. Tardiff, and Harold Ware on the sunset of BOC separate affiliate and related requirements, *ex parte* communication prepared for filing with the Federal Communications Commission on behalf of BellSouth, SBC, and Verizon, WC Docket No. 02-112 and CC Docket No. 00-175, August 10, 2004.

Reply Testimony of Timothy J. Tardiff on the use of the HAI, Release 5.3 Model for unbundled network elements costs, prepared for filing with the California Public Utilities Commission on behalf of Verizon California, Rulemaking 93-04-003, Investigation 93-04-0002, August 6, 2004.

Supplemental Reply Testimony of Timothy J. Tardiff on the use of the HAI, Release 5.3 Model for unbundled network elements costs, prepared for filing with the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission on behalf of Verizon Northwest, Docket No. UT-023003, June 18, 2004.

Rebuttal Testimony of Timothy J. Tardiff on the use of the HAI, Release 5.3 Model for unbundled network elements costs, prepared for filing with the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission on behalf of Verizon Northwest, Docket No. UT-023003, May 12, 2004.

Reply Declaration of Timothy J. Tardiff on the use of the HAI, Release 5.3 Model for unbundled network elements costs, prepared for filing with the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission on behalf of Verizon Northwest, Docket No. UT-023003, April 26, 2004.

Reply Testimony of Timothy J. Tardiff concerning geographic market definition, prepared for filing with the Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission on behalf of SBC Indiana, Cause No. 42500, February 13, 2004.

Direct Testimony of Timothy J. Tardiff concerning geographic market definition, prepared for filing with the Oklahoma State Corporation Commission on behalf of SBC Oklahoma, Cause No. 200300646, February 11, 2004.

Rebuttal Testimony of Timothy J. Tardiff concerning geographic market definition, prepared for filing with the Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission on behalf of SBC Indiana, Cause No. 42500, January 30, 2004.

Declaration of Howard Shelanski and Timothy Tardiff on the review of rules for pricing unbundled network elements, prepared for filing with the Federal

Communications Commission on behalf of Verizon, WC Docket No. 03-173, January 30, 2004.

Direct Testimony of Timothy J. Tardiff concerning geographic market definition, prepared for filing with the Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission on behalf of SBC Indiana, Cause No. 42500, January 16, 2004.

Rebuttal Testimony of Timothy J. Tardiff concerning geographic market definition, prepared for filing with the Missouri Public Service Commission on behalf of SBC Missouri, Case No. TO-2004-0207 Phase I, January 16, 2004.

Reply Testimony of Timothy J. Tardiff concerning geographic market definition, prepared for filing with the California Public Utilities Commission on behalf of SBC California, Rulemaking 95-04-043, Investigation 95-04-044, January 16, 2004.

Direct Testimony of Timothy J. Tardiff concerning geographic market definition, prepared for filing with the Missouri Public Service Commission on behalf of SBC Missouri, Case No. TO-2004-0207 Phase I, December 18, 2003.

Declaration of Alfred E. Kahn and Timothy Tardiff on the review of rules for pricing unbundled network elements, prepared for filing with the Federal Communications Commission on behalf of Verizon, WC Docket No. 03-173, December 16, 2003.

Direct Testimony of Timothy J. Tardiff concerning geographic market definition, prepared for filing with the California Public Utilities Commission on behalf of SBC California, Rulemaking 95-04-043, Investigation 95-04-044, December 12, 2003.

Direct Testimony of Timothy J. Tardiff concerning geographic market definition, prepared for filing with the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio on behalf of SBC Ohio, Case No. 03-2040-TP-COI, November 12, 2003.

Statement of Timothy J. Tardiff on the Commission's Telecommunications Service Obligation (TSO) Model, prepared for filing with the New Zealand Commerce Commission on behalf of Telecom Corporation of New Zealand, May 20, 2003.

Rebuttal Declaration of Timothy J. Tardiff on the use of the HAI, Release 5.3 Model for unbundled network elements costs, prepared for filing with the California Public Utilities Commission on behalf of SBC California, Application

Nos. 01-02-024, 01-02-035, 02-02-031, 02-02-032, and 02-03-002, March 12, 2003.

Reply Declaration of Timothy J. Tardiff on the use of the HAI, Release 5.3 Model for unbundled network elements costs, prepared for filing with the California Public Utilities Commission on behalf of SBC California, Application Nos. 01-02-024, 01-02-035, 02-02-031, 02-02-032, and 02-03-002, February 7, 2003.

Affidavit of Timothy J. Tardiff on the use of the FCC's Synthesis Model to calculate unbundled network switching and transport prices, prepared for filing with the Regulatory Commission of Alaska, on behalf of Alaska Communications Systems, Docket No. U-96-89, December 18, 2002.

Declaration of Timothy J. Tardiff in support of the Petition of Verizon for Forbearance From The Prohibition Of Sharing Operating, Installation, and Maintenance Functions Under Section 53.203(a)(2) Of The Commission's Rules, CC Docket No. 96-149, September 24, 2002.

Affidavit of Timothy J. Tardiff on unbundled network element pricing, prepared for filing with the Federal Communications Commission on behalf of ACS, WC Docket No. 02-201, July 24, 2002.

Reply Declaration of Alfred E. Kahn and Timothy J. Tardiff in the triennial review of unbundled network elements, prepared for filing with the Federal Communications Commission on behalf of Verizon, CC Docket Nos. 01-338, 96-98, and 98-147, July 17, 2002.

Statement of Alfred E. Kahn and Timothy J. Tardiff on funding the telecommunications service (universal service) obligation, prepared for filing with the New Zealand Commerce Commission on behalf of Telecom Corporation of New Zealand, June 10, 2002.

Supplemental Surrebuttal Testimony of Timothy Tardiff and Francis Murphy on the use of the FCC's Synthesis Model for evaluating the costs of unbundled network elements, prepared for filing with the Florida Public Service Commission on behalf of Verizon-Florida, Docket No. 990649B-TP, April 22, 2002.

Surrebuttal Testimony of Timothy Tardiff and Francis Murphy on the use of the FCC's Synthesis Model for evaluating the costs of unbundled network elements, prepared for filing with the Florida Public Service Commission on behalf of Verizon-Florida, Docket No. 990649B-TP, March 18, 2002.

Surrebuttal Testimony of Howard Shelanski and Timothy Tardiff on economic principles for determining the costs of unbundled network elements, prepared for filing with the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission on behalf of Verizon-Pennsylvania, Docket No. R-00016683, February 8, 2002.

Rebuttal Testimony of Timothy J. Tardiff and Joseph A. Gansert on the application of the Modified Synthesis Model for the costs of unbundled network elements, prepared for filing with the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission on behalf of Verizon-Pennsylvania, Docket No. R-00016683, February 8, 2002.

Rebuttal Testimony of Howard Shelanski and Timothy Tardiff on economic principles for determining the costs of unbundled network elements, prepared for filing with the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission on behalf of Verizon-Pennsylvania, Docket No. R-00016683, January 11, 2002.

Rebuttal Testimony of Timothy J. Tardiff on the application of the Modified Synthesis Model for the costs of unbundled network elements, prepared for filing with the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission on behalf of Verizon-Pennsylvania, Docket No. R-00016683, January 11, 2002.

Supplemental Rebuttal Testimony of Timothy J. Tardiff on the application of the Modified Synthesis Model for the costs of unbundled network elements, prepared for filing with the Federal Communications Commission on behalf of Verizon-Virginia, CC Docket Nos. 00-218, 00-249, and 00-251, November 16, 2001.

Declaration of Timothy J. Tardiff on the use of the HAI, Release 5.2a for deriving an unbundled switch cost reduction, prepared for filing with the California Public Utilities Commission on behalf of Pacific Bell, October 30, 2001.

Declaration of Timothy J. Tardiff on the use of the HAI, Release 5.2a for deriving an unbundled loop cost reduction, prepared for filing with the California Public Utilities Commission on behalf of Pacific Bell, October 19, 2001.

Surrebuttal Testimony of Howard Shelanski and Timothy J. Tardiff on economic principles for determining the costs of unbundled network elements, prepared for filing with the Federal Communications Commission on behalf of Verizon-Virginia, CC Docket Nos. 00-218, 00-249, and 00-251, September 21, 2001.

Rebuttal Testimony of Timothy J. Tardiff on the application of the Modified Synthesis Model for the costs of unbundled network elements, prepared for filing with the Maryland Public Service Commission on behalf of Verizon-Maryland, Case No. 8879, September 5, 2001.

Declaration of Timothy J. Tardiff on the use of the HAI, Release 5.2a and Modified Synthesis Models for unbundled loop and switch costs, prepared for filing with the California Public Utilities Commission on behalf of Pacific Bell, September 4, 2001.

Rebuttal Testimony of Timothy J. Tardiff on the application of the Modified Synthesis Model for the costs of unbundled network elements, prepared for filing with the Federal Communications Commission on behalf of Verizon-Virginia, CC Docket Nos. 00-218, 00-249, and 00-251, August 27, 2001.

Affidavit of Timothy J. Tardiff on the use of proxy costs models for unbundled network elements, prepared for filing with the Regulatory Commission of Alaska, on behalf of Alaska Communications Systems, Docket No. U-96-89, July 27, 2001.

Rebuttal Testimony of Timothy J. Tardiff on the application of the Hatfield Model for the costs of unbundled network elements, prepared for filing with the Massachusetts Department of Telecommunications and Energy on behalf of Verizon-Massachusetts, Docket No. D.T.E. 01-20, July 18, 2001.

Rebuttal Testimony of Timothy J. Tardiff on the application of the Hatfield Model for the costs of unbundled network elements, prepared for filing with the New Jersey Board of Public Utilities on behalf of Verizon-New Jersey, Docket No. TO00060356, October 12, 2000.

Supplemental Rebuttal Testimony of Timothy J. Tardiff on the Hatfield Model of unbundled network elements, prepared for filing with the State of Maine Public Utilities Commission on behalf of Bell Atlantic-Maine, Case No. 97-505, October 10, 2000.

Public Interest Affidavit before the Federal Communications Commission in the matter of Application of SBC Communications Inc. Nevada Bell Telephone Company and Southwestern Bell Communications Services, Inc. d/b/a Nevada Bell Long Distance for Provision of In-Region InterLATA Services in Nevada (with Alfred E. Kahn), July 24, 2000.

Responsive Testimony on the HAI Model of unbundled network elements, prepared for filing with the New York Public Service Commission on behalf of Bell Atlantic-New York, Case 98-C-1357 (filed as part of panel testimony), June 26, 2000.

Affidavit of Timothy J. Tardiff on avoided cost discounts for wholesale services, prepared for filing with the Regulatory Commission of Alaska, on behalf of Alaska Communications Systems, Docket Nos. U-99-141, U-99-142 and U-99-143, April 17, 2000.

Third Affidavit of Timothy J. Tardiff on costs models for unbundled network elements, prepared for filing with the Regulatory Commission of Alaska, on behalf of Alaska Communications Systems, Docket Nos. U-99-141, U-99-142 and U-99-143, March 24, 2000.

Second Affidavit of Timothy J. Tardiff on costs models for unbundled network elements, prepared for filing with the Regulatory Commission of Alaska, on behalf of Alaska Communications Systems, Docket Nos. U-99-141, U-99-142 and U-99-143, February 25, 2000.

Rebuttal Testimony of Timothy J. Tardiff on collocation costs models, prepared for filing with the Delaware Public Service Commission on behalf of Bell Atlantic-Delaware, Docket No. 99-251, February 24, 2000.

Affidavit of Timothy J. Tardiff on costs models for unbundled network elements, prepared for filing with the Regulatory Commission of Alaska, on behalf of Alaska Communications Systems, Docket Nos. U-99-141, U-99-142 and U-99-143, February 11, 2000.

Public Interest Affidavit before the Federal Communications Commission in the matter of Application of SBC Communications Inc. Southwestern Bell Telephone Company and Southwestern Bell Communications Services, Inc. d/b/a Southwestern Bell Long Distance for Provision of In-Region InterLATA Services in Texas (with Alfred E. Kahn), January 10, 2000.

Rebuttal Testimony of Timothy J. Tardiff on collocation costs models, prepared for filing with the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission on behalf of Bell Atlantic-Pennsylvania, Docket Nos. R-00994697 and R-00994697C0001, December 21, 1999.

“Relaxed Regulation of High Capacity Services in Phoenix and Seattle: The Time is Now,” prepared for filing with the Federal Communications Commission on behalf of US WEST Communications, Petitions of US WEST Communications for Forbearance from Regulation as a Dominant Carrier in the Phoenix and Seattle MSAs (with Alfred E. Kahn), July 21, 1999.

Rebuttal Testimony of Timothy J. Tardiff on the HAI Model of unbundled network elements, prepared for filing with the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission on behalf of Bell Atlantic-Pennsylvania, Docket Nos. P-00991648 and P-00991649, June 15, 1999.

“High Capacity Competition in Seattle: Reply to Comments of Intervening Parties,” prepared for filing with the Federal Communications Commission on behalf of US WEST Communications, Petition of US WEST Communications for Forbearance from Regulation as a Dominant Carrier in the Seattle, Washington MSA (with Alfred E. Kahn), March 10, 1999.

Rebuttal Testimony of Timothy J. Tardiff on collocation costs models, prepared for filing with the California Public Utilities Commission on behalf of Pacific Bell, February 8, 1999.

Surrebuttal Testimony of Alfred E. Kahn and Timothy J. Tardiff, filed with the Missouri Public Service Commission, in support of the Applications of SBC Communications, Inc., Southwestern Bell Telephone Company, and Southwestern Bell Communications Services, Inc., for Provision of In-Region InterLATA Services in Missouri, Docket No. TO 99-227, February 4, 1999.

Rebuttal Testimony of Timothy J. Tardiff on the HAI Model of unbundled network elements, prepared for filing with the Rhode Island Public Utilities Commission on behalf of Bell Atlantic-Rhode Island, Docket No. 2681, January 15, 1999.

Reply Testimony of Timothy J. Tardiff on collocation costs models, prepared for filing with the California Public Utilities Commission on behalf of Pacific Bell, January 11, 1999.

“Economic Evaluation of High Capacity Competition in Seattle,” prepared for filing with the Federal Communications Commission on behalf of US WEST Communications, Petition of US WEST Communications for Forbearance from Regulation as a Dominant Carrier in the Seattle, Washington MSA (with Alfred E. Kahn), December 22, 1998.

Testimony of Timothy J. Tardiff on collocation costs models, prepared for filing with the California Public Utilities Commission on behalf of Pacific Bell, December 18, 1998.

“Measuring and Recovering the Costs of Long-Term Number Portability: Implications of Price Cap Regulation,” Prepared for Southwestern Bell for presentation to the Federal Communications Commission, December 10, 1998.

Direct Testimony of Alfred E. Kahn and Timothy J. Tardiff, filed with the Missouri Public Service Commission, in support of the Applications of SBC Communications, Inc., Southwestern Bell Telephone Company, and Southwestern Bell Communications Services, Inc., for Provision of In-Region InterLATA Services in Missouri, Docket No. TO 99-227, November 20, 1998.

“High Capacity Competition in Phoenix: Reply to Comments of Intervening Parties,” prepared for filing with the Federal Communications Commission on behalf of US WEST Communications, Petition of US WEST Communications for Forbearance from Regulation as a Dominant Carrier in the Phoenix, Arizona MSA (with Alfred E. Kahn), October 28, 1998.

“Measuring and Recovering the Costs of Long-Term Number Portability,” Prepared for Southwestern Bell for presentation to the Federal Communications Commission, October 28, 1998 (with Alfred E. Kahn).

Declaration of Timothy J. Tardiff on the economic impacts of separate subsidiary requirements for the offer of advanced services by incumbent local exchange carriers, prepared for filing with the Federal Communications Commission on behalf of Bell Atlantic, in the matter of Deployment of Wireline Services Offering Advanced Telecommunications Capability, October 15, 1998.

“An Analysis of the HAI Model Release 5.0a,” Rebuttal Testimony filed with the Florida Public Service Commission, Docket No. 980696-TP, on behalf of GTE Florida, September 2, 1998 (with Gregory M. Duncan, Karyn E. Model, Christian M. Dippon, Jino W. Kim, Francis J. Murphy, Robert P. Cellupica, and Thomas F. Guarino).

“Economic Evaluation of High Capacity Competition in Phoenix,” prepared for filing with the Federal Communications Commission on behalf of US WEST Communications, Petition of US WEST Communications for Forbearance from Regulation as a Dominant Carrier in the Phoenix, Arizona MSA (with Alfred E. Kahn), August 14, 1998.

Rebuttal Testimony of Timothy J. Tardiff on the HAI Model of unbundled network elements, prepared for filing with the New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission on behalf of Bell Atlantic-New Hampshire, Docket No. DE-97-1171, June 22, 1998.

Rebuttal Affidavit before the Arkansas Public Service Commission in the matter of the Application of Southwestern Bell Telephone Company Seeking Verification

that It Has Fully Complied with and Satisfied the Requirements of Section 271 (c) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, June 11, 1998.

Rebuttal Testimony before the State Corporation Commission of the State of Kansas in the matter of Southwestern Bell Telephone Company – Kansas' Compliance With Section 271 of the Federal Telecommunications Act of 1996, Docket No. 97-SWBT- 411-GIT (with Alfred E. Kahn), May 27, 1998.

Rebuttal Affidavit Before the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California in support of Pacific Bell's Draft Application for Authority to Provide InterLATA Services in California (with Alfred E. Kahn), May 20, 1998.

"An Analysis of the Hatfield Model Release 4.0," prepared for filing with the California Public Utilities Commission on behalf of GTE California, May 1, 1998 (with Gregory M. Duncan, Karyn E. Model, Christian M. Dippon, Jino W. Kim, Francis J. Murphy, Robert P. Cellupica, and Thomas F. Guarino).

Reply Testimony of Timothy J. Tardiff on unbundled network element prices and retail service price floors, prepared for filing with the California Public Utilities Commission on behalf of Pacific Bell, April 27, 1998.

Rebuttal Testimony of Alfred E. Kahn and Timothy J. Tardiff, filed with the Oklahoma Public Service Commission, in support of the Applications of SBC Communications, Inc., Southwestern Bell Telephone Company, and Southwestern Bell Communications Services, Inc., for Provision of In-Region InterLATA Services in Oklahoma, Case No. PUD 970000560, April 21, 1998.

Reply Affidavit before the Federal Communications Commission in the matter of Application of SBC Communications Inc. Southwestern Bell Telephone Company and Southwestern Bell Communications Services, Inc. d/b/a Southwestern Bell Long Distance for Provision of In-Region InterLATA Services in Texas (with Alfred E. Kahn), April 17, 1998.

Testimony of Timothy J. Tardiff on unbundled network element prices and retail service price floors, prepared for filing with the California Public Utilities Commission on behalf of Pacific Bell, April 8, 1998.

Affidavit before the Federal Communications Commission in the matter of Application of SBC Communications Inc., Pacific Bell, and Pacific Bell Communications for Provision of In-Region InterLATA Services in California (with Alfred E. Kahn), March 31, 1998.

“Economic Principles Governing Measurement of Nonrecurring/OSS Costs: An Analysis of the AT&T/MCI Recommendations,” prepared for filing with the California Public Utilities Commission on behalf of GTE California and Pacific Bell, March 4, 1998 (with Gregory M. Duncan).

“Analysis of the Hatfield Model Release 5.0a,” Rebuttal Testimony filed with the North Carolina Utilities Commission, Docket No. P-100, Sub 133d, on behalf of GTE South, March 2, 1998 (with Gregory M. Duncan, Rafi A. Mohammed, Christian M. Dippon, Aniruddha Banerjee, Karyn E. Model, Francis J. Murphy, Robert P. Cellupica, and Thomas F. Guarino).

“Analysis of the Hatfield Model Release 5.0a,” Rebuttal Testimony filed with the South Carolina Public Service Commission, on behalf of GTE South, March 2, 1998 (with Gregory M. Duncan, Rafi A. Mohammed, Christian M. Dippon, Aniruddha Banerjee, Karyn E. Model, Francis J. Murphy, Robert P. Cellupica, and Thomas F. Guarino).

Affidavit before the Federal Communications Commission in the matter of Application of SBC Communications Inc. Southwestern Bell Telephone Company and Southwestern Bell Communications Services, Inc. d/b/a Southwestern Bell Long Distance for Provision of In-Region InterLATA Services in Texas (with Alfred E. Kahn), March 2, 1998.

“Analysis of the Hatfield Model Release 5.0a,” Rebuttal Testimony filed with the Kentucky Public Service Commission, on behalf of GTE South, February 26, 1998 (with Gregory M. Duncan, Rafi A. Mohammed, Christian M. Dippon, Aniruddha Banerjee, Karyn E. Model, Francis J. Murphy, Robert P. Cellupica, and Thomas F. Guarino).

Affidavit before the Federal Communications Commission in the matter of Application of SBC Communications Inc. Southwestern Bell Telephone Company and Southwestern Bell Communications Services, Inc. d/b/a Southwestern Bell Long Distance for Provision of In-Region InterLATA Services in Arkansas (with Alfred E. Kahn), February 24, 1998.

Testimony before the State Corporation Commission of the State of Kansas in the matter of Southwestern Bell Telephone Company – Kansas’ Compliance With Section 271 of the Federal Telecommunications Act of 1996, Docket No. 97-SWBT- 411-GIT (with Alfred E. Kahn), February 17, 1998.

“Analysis of the Hatfield Model Release 5.0,” Rebuttal Testimony filed with the Alabama Public Utilities Commission, on behalf of GTE South, February 13, 1998

(with Gregory M. Duncan, Rafi A. Mohammed, Christian M. Dippon, Aniruddha Banerjee, Karyn E. Model, Francis J. Murphy, Robert P. Cellupica, and Thomas F. Guarino).

Affidavit before the Federal Communications Commission in the matter of Application of SBC Communications, Inc. Southwestern Bell Telephone Company and Southwestern Bell Communications Services, Inc. d/b/a/ Southwestern Bell Long Distance for Provision of In-Region InterLATA Services in Oklahoma (with Alfred E. Kahn), February 13, 1998.

“Analysis of the Hatfield Model Release 5.0,” Rebuttal Testimony filed with the North Carolina Utilities Commission, Docket No. P-100, Sub 133b, on behalf of GTE South, January 30, 1998 (with Gregory M. Duncan, Rafi A. Mohammed, Christian M. Dippon, Aniruddha Banerjee, Karyn E. Model, Francis J. Murphy, Robert P. Cellupica, and Thomas F. Guarino).

Supplemental Rebuttal Testimony of Timothy J. Tardiff on switching costs, prepared for filing with the State of Maine Public Utilities Commission on behalf of Bell Atlantic-Maine, Case No. 97-505, December 22, 1997.

“Reply to AT&T Recommendations for Regulatory Treatment of OSS Costs,” prepared for filing with the California Public Utilities Commission on behalf of GTE California and Pacific Bell, December 15, 1997 (with Gregory M. Duncan).

Rebuttal Testimony of Timothy J. Tardiff on the Hatfield Model of unbundled network elements, prepared for filing with the Vermont Public Service Board on behalf of Bell Atlantic-Vermont, Case No. 57-13, November 21, 1997.

Reply Affidavit of Timothy J. Tardiff on the Hatfield Model, filed with the New York Public Service Commission on behalf of Bell Atlantic-New York, Case 94-C-0095 and Case 28425, November 17, 1997.

Rebuttal Testimony of Timothy J. Tardiff on the Hatfield Model of unbundled network elements, prepared for filing with the State of Maine Public Utilities Commission on behalf of Bell Atlantic-Maine, Case No. 97-505, October 21, 1997.

Rebuttal Testimony of Timothy J. Tardiff on the application of the Hatfield Model to universal service funding requirements, prepared for filing with the New Jersey Board of Public Utilities on behalf of Bell Atlantic-New Jersey, Docket No. TX95120631, October 20, 1997.